

## Wichita-Sedgwick County Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee Meeting

MAPC Large Conference Room, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor, City Hall

4:15-6:00 p.m., October 16, 2013

### ***Discussion Highlights & Points of Agreement:***

#### *Attendance - Plan Steering Committee:*

Stacy Christie, David Foster, Peggy Elliott, Susan Estes, Julie Hedrick, Joe Johnson, Dustin Kuhn, Cindy Miles, Mitch Mitchell, Tim Norton, Randy Oliver, Richard Ranzau, James Roseboro, Gary Schmitt, George Sherman, Debra Miller Stevens

#### *Attendance - Project Staff:*

Stephen Banks, Dave Barber, Scott Knebel, Jess McNeely, John Schlegel, Scott Wadle

### **1. Welcome -**

The meeting was called to order by Peggy Elliott. Peggy requested that the Committee go into a closed discussion session and requested staff and the public to leave the room.

### **2. Committee Closed Discussion -**

### **3. Committee Workshop – Discussion and Modifications to the Wichita/Sedgwick County 2035 Baseline Community Investment Scenario**

Peggy Elliott informed Committee members that the City Manager spoke to her and advised that the City Council would like the Committee to develop at least two additional scenarios for consideration - an infill-focused growth scenario; and a more balanced growth scenario that blends infill and baseline growth trends. The Committee discussed the various opportunities and challenges associated with the creation of these additional scenarios.

Dave Barber presented a re-cap of the main elements of the 2035 Baseline Community Investment Scenario. Barber presented the infrastructure cost implications associated with an average of 2.25 persons per household versus an average of 2.15 persons per household size by 2035 – this difference eliminates the need for almost 10,000 fewer dwelling units and translates into reduced transportation and health/environment infrastructure costs totaling \$0.4 billion.

Barber had each Committee member rank on a scale of 1 to 4 (1 highest; 4 lowest), the relative importance of the four basic cost categories associated with the baseline scenario. The ranking results were as follows:

- |  |                           |
|--|---------------------------|
| 1. Cost to bring existing Wichita assets up to standards           | 1.8 average ranking score |
| 2. Depreciation replacement cost of Wichita's existing assets      | 2.0 average ranking score |
| 3. Cost of new infrastructure assets to support new Wichita growth | 2.9 average ranking score |
| 4. Cost of proposed asset enhancements to improve quality of life  | 3.3 average ranking score |

Barber discussed the following three key interrelated elements that impact Infrastructure investment decisions and scenario development:

- *Shape of the Community* – determining how the physical configuration, condition and capacity of public infrastructure impacts future infrastructure investment priorities and decisions.
- *Setting Priorities* – determining investment need and wants, and setting investment priorities within needs and wants categories.
- *How Much to Invest?* – determining whether more, the same or less funding should be made available for future infrastructure investment.

Barber asked each Committee member in turn what they would change about the 2035 Baseline Community Survey. Responses were recorded on flip charts and are summarized as follows:

- Need to do a better job of preserving/maintaining our current infrastructure assets

- Need to place importance on securing the long term viability of the established central city area and existing neighborhoods.
- The established central city area should be an emphasis for future infrastructure investment and redevelopment incentives.
- Need to provide/locate housing to better attract and retain the millennial generation.
- Policies in some of the city's existing neighborhood plans may be helpful in supporting the long term vitality and redevelopment of the established central city areas – need to review relevancy of existing neighborhood plans.
- Explore other infrastructure financing methods and/or providers other than what has traditionally been done by the city – consider development fees in the suburban growth areas and using special assessment districts to fund infrastructure replacement in the established central city area.
- Change zoning regulations: reduce the current regulations on development; allow increased densities of people per dwelling unit and/or increased dwelling units (e.g. make it easier to allow multi-generational housing units).
- Current utility rates need to be increased to ensure sufficient funding is available to maintain, replace, upgrade and expand the city's water and sewer utility.

A discussion followed about the responses on the flip charts. The following is a listing of possible distinguishing elements or characteristics of a modified baseline or alternate growth scenario:

- Continued residential and employment growth at the suburban fringes of Wichita and in the downtown, but also increased levels of redevelopment and infill development throughout the established central city area.
- Evaluate the job and housing growth impacts should the State not be able to fund the construction of the NW Bypass by 2035.
- Allocate some of Wichita's projected new housing growth to the small cities and/or unincorporated areas surrounding Wichita.
- Evaluate infill and/or redevelopment opportunities within the existing established infrastructure service areas of Wichita.
- Better evaluate and refine the new housing growth areas as depicted - avoid new housing development in flood prone areas.

Staff indicated they were willing to assist the Committee in developing an 'infill-focused' scenario and will bring some indicator data to assist the Committee at the next meeting on October 30<sup>th</sup>.

#### **4. Committee Open Discussion -**

None

#### **5. Set Next Steering Committee Meeting -**

October 30, 2013, 3:45-5:30 p.m. in the MAPC Large Conference Room, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor, City Hall (note new start time for all future Committee meetings)

#### **6. Comments from Public Attendees -**

None

#### **7. Adjourned - 6:10 p.m.**